

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 20, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 14, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glance *et al.*, "One-THz Digital Random Access High Resolution Optical Frequency Synthesizer Providing Cold-Start Operation From A Frequency Reference" (referred to herein as "Glance") in view of Li *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0007522 (referred to herein as "Li") and Anton *et al.*, U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2003/0026302 (referred to herein as "Anton").

The Examiner also objected to claims 8-13, 15-17, 20, and 21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

Applicant has cancelled claims 8 and 27. Therefore, the rejection of those claims is now moot.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 8, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claim 8, and Applicant has cancelled claim 8. As a result, claim 1 now recites the subject matter of claim 8 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Claim 1 is thus now in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-5, 9-17, and 20-21 all depend ultimately from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 26, Applicant has amended independent claim 26 to include all of the limitations of claim 8 in means-plus-function format. Since claim 26 has been amended to mirror the method steps of claim 8 in means-plus-function format, Applicant

submits that claim 26 now recites the subject matter that the Examiner indicated would be allowable in reference to claim 8. Claim 26 is thus now in condition for allowance.

By making the amendments noted above, Applicant does not acquiesce in the claim rejections. However, Applicant has made the claim amendments without prejudice in order to expedite prosecution.

Applicant also notes that amendments to claims 10-17 to remove multiple dependencies (e.g., deleting language such as “a method as claims in any of the proceeding claims”), which were made in the Preliminary Amendment filed October 13, 2005, were inadvertently omitted in Applicant’s previous Response filed November 21, 2008. Therefore, Applicant has reincorporated these amendments so that claims 10-17 are of singular dependency, and updated the status of the claims to properly indicate that claims 10-17 were previously presented. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 21 to properly depend from claim 5 (rather than canceled claim 18).

Now pending in this application are claims 1-5, 9-17, 20-21, and 26, of which claims 1 and 26 are independent and the remainder are dependent. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and thus Applicant respectfully requests notice to that effect.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of this application, the Examiner is welcome to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3341.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: June 22, 2009

By: /Michael D. Clifford/
Michael D. Clifford
Reg. No. 60,550